UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,303	03/09/2004	Gary Weller	514362001410	4452
John S. Nagy	7590 09/09/200	EXAMINER		
(Fulwider, Patto	on, Lee & Utecht, LLF	YABUT, DIANE D		
Howard Hughes 6060 Center Dr	s Center ive, Tenth Floor	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Los Angeles, C	A 90045	3734		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/797,303	WELLER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	DIANE YABUT	3734	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 August 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ai no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount on the tened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second con	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); lucing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·		•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 29-36. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Todd E Manahan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3734			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments are considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant generally argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would not modify Deem with Adams to provide the first and second tissue acquisitions of Deem in a pivotable relationship about a longitudinal hinge, because doing so would not provide any benefit. However, Deem discloses stapler devices 170 and 190 (Figures 9A-10) with elongate first and second acquisition members divided by septa 184 and 196 that would benefit from a longitudinal hinge, as taught by Adams' stapler device in Figures 21-25, which shows a first 10 and second 17 tissue acquisition member that may be adjusted relative to one another to acquire tissue. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide this longitudinal hinge since both Deem and Adams invovle stapling devices wherein grasping and acquiring tissue is facilitated by pivotable members to ensure secure engagement. Providing a hinge about which two tissue acquisition members can pivot is old and well known in the art.

Applicant also generally argues that stapler 17 and anvil of Adams cannot be considered as "tissue acquisition members." However, being a stapler, both elements contact or engage tissue at some point, and therefore read on this limitation.

Lastly, applicant asserts that the elements of claim 35 have not been discussed by the examiner, including first and second tissue receiving cavities between the stapling member and the anvil member. However, for example in Deem Figures 9A-9B there are first and second tissue cavities in between anvil 182 and stapler 172 and divided between the septum 184, and therefore the device reads on this limitation.